



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/844,336	04/18/1997	PAMELA R. CONTAG	8678-004-999	7227

7590 05/28/2010  
ROBINS & PASTERNAK LLP  
1731 EMBARCADERO ROAD  
SUITE 230  
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER
----------

ZEMAN, ROBERT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1645

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/28/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 08/844,336	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CONTAG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ROBERT A. ZEMAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 1645	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,6,21,22 and 25-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,6,21,22 and 25-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The amendment filed on 3-9-2010 is acknowledged. Claims 1, 5-6 and 27 have been amended. Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled. Claims 1, 5-6, 21-22 and 25-27 are pending and currently under examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections Maintained***

#### ***35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 9, 21-22 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is maintained for reasons of record. The cancellation of claims 7-8 has rendered the rejection of those claims moot. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

#### **Applicant argues:**

1. The amended claims do not encompass limitless combinations of transmembrane fusion proteins as they require that the extracellular domain be an antibody and the intracellular domain be a phosphorylase or phosphatase.
2. Transmembrane fusions of antibodies and phosphatases or phosphorylases were well known in the art and described in the instant specification (i.e. Example 2).

3. The chemical structures of light generating proteins are clearly described in the instant specification.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and deemed non-persuasive.

With regard to Points 1-3, while the components of the instant invention may have been known in the art, the compatibility of said components which give rise to a functional biodetector was not. The instant claims encompass biodetectors comprising limitless combinations of transmembrane fusion proteins (comprising an extracellular ligand binding domain [i.e. antibody] and a membrane intracellular enzymatic signal domain [i.e. a phosphatase or phosphorylase), transducers and responsive element which generates a detectable light signal. As disclosed in the specification, one must empirically determine which combination of components function as intended (see pages 26-28 of the specification). Given the lack of guidance within the specification, the skilled artisan would not know what **combination of elements** would produce a biodetector that functions as claimed. Applicant is reminded that adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and *reference to a potential method for isolating it*. The functional fusion protein itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016.

As outlined previously, the instant claims are drawn to a biodetector comprising a transmembrane fusion protein comprising an extracellular ligand-specific moiety comprising an antibody and a membrane intracellular enzymatic signal-transforming domain (i.e. signal-converting element {phosphatase or phosphorylase); a transducer and a responsive element (transcription activation element) coupled to a reporter gene (luciferase) via said responsive element. Said biodetector may further comprise a bacterial cell.

Art Unit: 1645

The specification discloses a biodetector comprising a fusion protein consisting of an antibody heavy chain and an active domain of PhoQ, PhoP (signal transducer) and the *lux* operon coupled to the Pho promoter. This biodetector meets the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. However, the aforementioned claims are directed to encompass biodetectors comprising limitless combinations of transmembrane fusion proteins (comprising an extracellular antibody domain and an intracellular enzymatic signal domain), transducers and reporter genes/operons. None of these biodetectors meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim. The transmembrane fusion protein of the claimed biodetector must be able to activate a given transducer via its intracellular enzymatic signal transforming domain upon the binding of the "ligand" to the extracellular antibody. The transducers must be able to trigger either directly or indirectly, the activation of a transcription activating element (promoter) to effect the activation of the responsive element (reporter gene or operon). The Specification discloses that said transducer may be any molecule that can recognize and respond to a change in conformation, electrical charge, addition or subtraction of any chemical subgroup and is capable of triggering a detectable response (see page 16 of the specification). With the exception of the antibody/PhoQ based biodetector which utilizes PhoP as its transducer and the Pho promoter coupled to the *lux* operon as its responsive element, the specification is silent with regard to what specific combinations of transmembrane proteins, transducers and responsive elements would result in a functional biodetector.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now*

Art Unit: 1645

*claimed.*" (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

With the exception of the aforementioned antibody/PhoQ based biodetector, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed polynucleotides and/or proteins, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The nucleic acid itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Finally, University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404. 1405 held that: ...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and does so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." *Lockwood v. American Airlines Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); *In re Gosteli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." *Id.* at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

The name cDNA is not itself a written description of that DNA; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. While the example provides a process for obtaining human insulin-encoding cDNA, there is no further information in the patent pertaining to that cDNA's relevant structural or physical characteristics; in other words, it thus does not describe human insulin cDNA. Describing a method of preparing a cDNA or even describing the protein that the cDNA encodes, as the example does, does not necessarily describe the cDNA itself. No sequence information indicating which nucleotides

Art Unit: 1645

constitute human cDNA appears in the patent, as appears for rat cDNA in Example 5 of the patent. Accordingly, the specification does not provide a written description of the invention of claim 5.

Therefore, only aforementioned antibody/PhoQ based biodetector, but not the full breadth of the claims meets the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The species specifically disclosed is not representative of the genus because the genus is highly variant. Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

### ***Conclusion***

No claim is allowed.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1645

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT A. ZEMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0866. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday, 7am -5:30 p.m. .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Mondesi can be reached on (571) 272-0956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert A. Zeman/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645  
May 26, 2010